



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,741	06/04/2001	Kristen L. Bhatti	10008151-1	4871

7590 07/26/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/873,741	BHATTI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tammy T. Nguyen	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on May 9, 2006.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Colby et al.
(USPN 6,625,643– Date of Patent: September 23, 2003, herein referred to as “Colby”).

5. As to claim 1, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for selectively providing technical support documents from a web server having access to the requested technical support documents to a peripheral device that has printer, scanner and/or fax functionality via the Internet, the peripheral device being of the type which is capable of executing activated operating events and having an associated web client with a stored default URL for accessing the web server, the method comprising the steps of: activating an event on the device (see col.29, lines 7-43); requesting the default uniform resource locator with the activated event (see col.29, lines 7-43) and returning to the device one or more of the technical support documents (see col.4, lines 5-22) that relate to the activated event of the requested uniform resource locator (see col.29, lines 7-43, col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col.12, lines 6-60).
6. As to claim 2, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising the steps of: reading device configurations from the web client; determining whether to print or display the returned technical support document from the device configuration; printing the returned one or more technical support document (see col.5, lines 5-22) when the device configuration indicates print (See col.16, lines 35-53); and, displaying the returned technical support document when the device configuration indicates display (see col.20, lines 40-55).
7. As to claim 6, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein, prior to said step of requesting a default uniform resource locator with the activated event (see col.29,

lines 7-43), further comprising the step of obtaining a default uniform resource locator from the web client (see col.8, lines 37-67).

8. As to claim 7, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a method comprising: in response to receiving a help command, identifying an event which has occurred on a peripheral device where the event has produced an error (see col.24, lines 1-5) (Colby teaches clicking on the event name will produce a report used by event); using a default uniform resource locator to transmit a request to a web server (see col.8, lines 36-53, Colby teaches create a default page for the event); and where the request causes the web server to return one or more technical support documents which relate to the error (see col.29, lines 7-21) (Colby teaches if the response message is received matching the Event ID).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby et al., (hereinafter Colby) U.S. Patent No. 6,625,643 in view of Michael I. Moher., (hereinafter Moher) U.S. Patent No. 6,161,209.

11. As to claim 3, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for selectively providing technical support documents from a web server having access to the requested technical support documents to a peripheral device that has printer, scanner and/or fax functionality via the Internet, the peripheral device being of the type which is capable of executing activated operating events and having an associated web client with a stored default URL for accessing the web server, the method comprising the steps of: activating an event on the device (see col.29, lines 7-43); requesting the default uniform resource locator with the activated event (see col.29, lines 7-43); and returning to the device one or more of the technical support documents that relate to the activated event of the requested uniform resource locator (see col.29, lines 7-43, col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col.12, lines 6-60), wherein said step of requesting the default uniform resource locator further comprising the steps of: reading a device state table of the peripheral device; obtaining a most recently activated event from the device state table; and determining whether the most recently activated (see col.29, lines 7-21). But Colby does not explicitly teach produced an error. However, Moher teaches produced an error (see col.44, lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Moher into the computer system of Colby to have producing an error because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that allows the permissible interference to be increased and bandwidth to be conserved.

12. As to claim 4, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said step of determining whether the most recently activated event is an error further comprising the steps of: selecting the most recently activated event when the most recently activated event and requesting the default uniform resource locator without an activated event when the most recently activated event did not device (see col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col.12, lines 6-60). But Colby does not explicitly teach produced an error. However, Moher teaches produced an error (see col.44, lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Moher into the computer system of Colby to have producing an error because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that allows the permissible interference to be increased and bandwidth to be conserved.
13. As to claim 5, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said step of obtaining a default uniform resource locator further comprising the steps of: returning a help menu for activating an event (see col.29, lines 7-43); displaying the help menu to the user; choosing an event from the help menu by the user and selecting the chosen event from the help menu as the selected event (see col.32, lines 45-67).
14. Claims 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby et al., (hereinafter Colby) U.S. Patent No. 6,625,643 of Michael I. Moher., (hereinafter Moher) U.S. Patent No. 6,161,209 in view Parupudi et al., (hereinafter Parupudi) U.S. Patent No. 6, 859,829

15. As to claim 8, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program codes embodied in the medium that when executed causes a computer to: obtain a most recently activated event from a device state table in a peripheral device computer (col.6, lines 16-56, and col.29, lines 8-43); request a default uniform resource locator for a server having technical support documents relating to the most recently activated event and return one or more technical support documents (see col.4, lines 5-22) relating to the most recently activated event to the device (see col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, col.12, lines 6-60, and col.29, lines 8-43). But Colby and Moher do not explicitly teach a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality. However, Parupudi teaches a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality (see Fig.1, and col.4, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Purupudi into the computer system of Colby to have a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions which is not wasting of consumes resources.
16. As to claim 9, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program codes embodied in the medium that when executed causes a computer to: select an event on a peripheral device where the event has produced an error message

(see col.24, lines 1-5) (Colby teaches clicking on the event name will produce a report used by event); obtain a default uniform resource locator from firmware of the peripheral device (col.6, lines 16-56); request the default uniform resource locator to transmit to a remote computer a request that identifies at least one or the selected event and the error message (see col.29, lines 7-21) (Colby teaches if the response message is received matching the Event ID); and return to the peripheral device one or more technical support documents (see col.4, lines 5-22) error message (see col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col.20, lines 5-65). But Colby and Moher do not explicitly teach a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality. However, Parupudi teaches a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality (see Fig.1, and col.4, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Purupudi into the computer system of Colby to have a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions which is not wasting of consumes resources.

17. As to claim 10, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for providing technical support documents to a peripheral device via the Internet, comprising: a peripheral device having a web client for requesting a relevant technical support document of an activated event (see col.29, lines 7-43) the peripheral device being configured to request, in response to an error event, a relevant technical support document from a web server using a default uniform resource

- locator (see col.8, lines 36-53, Colby teaches create a default page for the event); and a web server for responding to the request by returning the relevant technical support document relating to the error events (see col.29, lines 7-21) (Colby teaches checking for response messages in the eventmessage if matching the Event ID, the user will received notification event)(see col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, col.12, lines 6-60, and col.20, lines 5-65). But Colby and Moher do not explicitly teach a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality. However, Parupudi teaches a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality (see Fig.1, and col.4, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Purupudi into the computer system of Colby to have a peripheral device having printer, scanner and/or fax functionality because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions which is not wasting of consumes resources.
18. As to claim 11, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising a dedicated switch on the peripheral device for users to request technical support documents (see fig.1 peripheral device).
19. As to claim 12, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said dedicated switch is a push button located on the peripheral device (see col.32, lines 45-67).
20. As to claim 13, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said dedicated switch is an icon that is displayed on the control panel of the peripheral device (see col.20, lines 45-50).

21. As to claim 14, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said peripheral device further comprising a device state table for storing a log of events of the device, wherein the most recently activated event from the device state table is the activated event (see col.29, lines 7-43); when the peripheral device makes a technical support document request (see col.29, lines 7-28).
22. As to claim 15, Colby teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the activated event is appended to the request for the default uniform resource locator (see col.8, lines 40-67).

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments filed on May 9, 2006 have been fully considered, however they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:
24. Applicants argue that Colby does not teach activating an event on the device; requesting default URL with the activated event; and returning to the device one or more of the technical support documents that relate to the activated event of the requested URL. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Examiner maintain the rejection because Colby does teach activating an event on the device; requesting default URL with the activated event; and returning to the device one or more of the technical support documents that relate to the activated event of the requested URL as shown in see col.29, lines 7-43 (Active server page reservation script will be periodically checking for response message in the event message if matching the event ID then user will receive notification that event will be accepted) see col.4, lines 5-22, see col.29, lines 7-43, col.8, lines 11-51, col.9, lines 1-48, and col.12, lines

6-60 (The Topology Manager will the create a default page for the event in the directory). Colby clearly shown all limitations in claim 1.

25. Applicants argue that there is no motivation to combine the references. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Moher into the computer system of Colby to have producing an error because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that allows the permissible interference to be increased and bandwidth to be conserved.
26. Applicants argue that Moher fails to teach or suggest determining whether the most recently activated event produced an error. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Examiner maintain the rejection because Moher teaches determining whether the most recently activated event produced an error as shown in col.44, lines 60-67 (if all minimum distance events produced an error and the bits are...e.g). Moher clearly shows activated event produced an error.

27. Applicants argue that Colby does not disclose feature return one or more technical support documents relating to the activating event. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Examiner maintain the rejection because Colby does teach feature return one or more technical support documents relating to the activating event as shown in see col.4, lines 5-22 (broadcast events that are served from data stream to user terminal). Colby clearly shows return or broadcast technical support documents to activating event.
28. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 3, 7-10. Claims 2, 4-6, and 11-15 are also rejected at least by the virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action.
29. Accordingly, claims 1-15 are respectfully rejected.

Conclusion

30. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,


however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tammy T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3929. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *William Vaughn* can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TTN
July 20, 2006


WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100